

REMARKS

The Office Action of 02/26/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

A REPLACEMENT SHEET for the drawing sheet that includes Figure 1 is submitted herewith. Minor amendments to the specification and claims have been made as suggested.


Claims 10, 13 and 15-17 were rejected as being anticipated by Vilppula. Claim 11 was rejected as being unpatentable over Vilppula in view of Roel-Ng. Claims 18-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Vilppula in view of Yabe. Claims 1-4 were rejected as being unpatentable over Vilppula in view of Roel-Ng and further in view of Yabe. Claims 6-9 were rejected as being unpatentable over the foregoing combination further in view of Ludwig. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited references. Reconsideration respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have been amended to recite in part determining context information, including whether a user is in transit, on foot or indoors, and depending on the context information, choosing a corresponding position determination device selection process based on the value of said at least one parameter for each position determination device.

No such context determination is made in Vilppula.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-11, 13 and 15-21 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 07/26/2007